

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Office Action mailed on February 11, 2004. Claims 1-21 and 49-67 are pending in the present application, with claims 1-21 being previously presented and claims 49-67 being newly added. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

A. Cancelled Claims

Claims 22-48 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Therefore, rejections related to any of claims 22-48 are rendered moot, and Applicants should not be presumed to agree with any statements made by the Examiner regarding any of claims 22-48 unless otherwise specifically indicated by Applicants.

B. New Claims

Claim 49-67 have been newly added. The newly added claims 49-67 are adequately supported by the specification. Consideration of new claims 49-67 is respectfully requested. The references cited by the Examiner do not disclose, teach, or suggest any of the newly added claims 49-67.

Claims 49-64

Claims 49-64 are allowable for at least the reason that none of the cited references teach, suggest, or disclose "wherein said at least one of the plurality of configurations corresponds to one of the first type of configuration and the second type of configuration."

Claims 65-67

Claims 65-67 are allowable for at least the reason that none of the cited references teach, suggest, or disclose "providing by the STT a first television program guide screen configured according to said one of the initial television program guide configurations responsive to receiving the second user input."

C. Rejected Claims

Claims 1-21 continue to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lajoie* (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,218) in view of “*The Complete Idiot’s Guide to Windows 95, 2nd ed.*” (“*McFedries*”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants continue to maintain that (a) *Lajoie* and *McFedries* do not teach, suggest, or disclose the subject matter of claims 1-21, (b) a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine *Lajoie* and *McFedries*, (c) *McFedries* does not suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the art the desirability of modifying the television program guide systems and methods disclosed in *Lajoie* in a manner that renders any of the pending claims 1-21 obvious, (d) *McFedries* and *Lajoie* correspond to non-analogous arts, and (e) claims 1-21 may have only been obvious in hindsight to a person of ordinary skill in the art after having read Applicants’ disclosure.

Lajoie is directed to systems and methods related to television set-top terminals, whereas *McFedries* is directed to using Windows 95, an operating system for personal computers. The cited portion of *McFedries* is directed to using a Windows Explorer application, whereas the current invention is directed to television set-top terminals (STTs) configured to provide television program guides, and to related methods.

McFedries is directed to using Windows 95, an operating system for personal computers. For purposes of the present claims, a personal computer (PC) is substantially different than an STT (a limitation in the current claims). For example, as compared to an STT, a PC typically is more difficult to operate, has more computing resources, and has different input/output resources.

The portion of *McFedries* cited by the Office Action relates to using a Windows Explorer application. A Windows Explorer application is substantially different from a program guide application implemented by an STT to provide television program listings. For example, a Windows Explorer application is primarily a file management system, whereas a program guide application may be viewed by those reasonably skilled in the art as being a program listing viewing system (as of the effective filing date of the current application). Furthermore, as compared to a program guide application, a Windows Explorer application typically is more difficult to operate, is supported by more computing resources, is responsive to different input resources, and provides outputs via different output resources.

Files that are managed by a Windows Explorer application are substantially different from program listings provided by an STT. For example, files depicted by a Windows Explorer application typically represent data and/or software stored on a PC, whereas program listings provided by an STT typically represent television programs that are to be received by the STT. Furthermore, files depicted by a Windows Explorer application continue to be depicted by the Windows Explorer application for an indefinite period of time (e.g., until deleted by a user), whereas program listings provided by an STT change over time (i.e., older program listings are replaced by newer program listings as time goes by). As another example, unlike program listings depicted by an STT, files are typically depicted by a Windows Explorer application as icons that can be dragged and manipulated by a user.

Furthermore, the combination of *McFedries* and *Lajoie*, even if proper, do not render any of the pending claims obvious. For example, the combination of *McFedries* and *Lajoie* might suggest a system for managing files stored on an STT, but such combination does not teach, suggest or disclose “said configuration information comprising a plurality of initial guide arrangements and a selection indication that denotes one of said plurality of initial guide arrangements as a selected initial guide arrangement.”

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-21 and 49-67 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

Sami O. Malas

Sami O. Malas
Sami O. Malas Registration No.: 44,893

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500